

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 720

CE 011 551

TITLE An Overview of Findings and Recommendations of Major Research Studies and National Commissions Concerning Education of Offenders. Report No. 81.

INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.; Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Mar 76

NOTE 26p.

AVAILABLE FROM Education Commission of the States, 822 Lincoln Tower Building, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203 (\$3.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Administrative Agencies; *Adults; College Cooperation; *Correctional Education; Corrective Institutions; *Delinquents; *Educational Needs; Educational Programs; Educational Research; High School Equivalency Programs; Interagency Cooperation; Literature Reviews; National Surveys; Post Secondary Education; *Prisoners

IDENTIFIERS United States

ABSTRACT

After a brief introduction describing the goals and proposed activities of the 3-year Correctional Education Project (which began in January 1975), 10 studies, pulled together by the project and representing comprehensive research about correctional education and systems, are analyzed. (Correctional education is defined generally as the educational programs and processes available to adult and juvenile offenders after adjudication. The term is also used to refer to institution-based education of inmates.) Two kinds of studies are included: The work of five national commissions that looked at a variety of critical issues in corrections, including correctional education; and five published national studies that specifically address issues in either adult or juvenile correctional education. The authors note that because the studies are comprehensive in what they attempt to do, they can be considered seriously by policymakers particularly at the national level. Titles of the studies are "Corrections," "Educational Programs in Adult Correctional Institutions," "GED Testing in State Penal Institutions," "An Evaluation of 'New Gate' and Other Prisoner Education Programs," "School Behind Bars--A Descriptive Overview of Correctional Education in the American Prison System," "Education for the Youthful Offender in Correctional Institutions," "The Criminal Offender--What Should Be Done?" "A Time to Act," "State-Local Relations in the Criminal Justice System," and "The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice: Task Force on Corrections." (SH)

ED142720

AN OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
OF MAJOR RESEARCH STUDIES AND NATIONAL COMMISSIONS
CONCERNING EDUCATION OF OFFENDERS

Staff Report

Correctional Education Project
Education Commission of the States

STAFF

James Peterson—Project Director
David Friend—Associate Director
Roger Lauen—Model Programs Evaluator
Alex Marin—State Liaison Specialist

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ECS PROJECT SUPERVISION

Wendell H. Pierce
Executive Director
Ben Mason
Director of
Planning and Development

Report No. 81
March 1976

Additional copies of this booklet may be obtained for ^{30¢}~~\$1.50~~.

The Correctional Education Project is funded cooperatively by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Washington, D.C., and member states of the Education Commission of the States (ECS).

CE 011 551

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Corrections	3
Educational Programs in Adult Correctional Institutions	5
GED Testing in State Penal Institutions	7
Evaluation of "NewGate" and Other Prisoner Education Programs	8
School Behind Bars—Correctional Education in the American Prison System	11
Education for the Youthful Offender in Correctional Institutions	13
The Criminal Offender—What Should Be Done? President's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation	15
A Time to Act Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower	16
State-Local Relations in the Criminal Justice System Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	17
The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice: Task Force on Corrections	19

INTRODUCTION

In response to the needs of its constituents, the Education Commission of the States (ECS) began the Correctional Education Project in January 1975. It had become apparent that the people in the states who make decisions about corrections understand that correctional education must be improved. At the same time, both because of conflicting theories about corrections and the lack of clear, comprehensive guidelines about what should be done to make improvements, most legislators, governors, corrections professionals and others have often been unable to move in the direction of positive changes. This appears to be the case in corrections as it is with correctional education.

Through an advisory committee of leaders in state and federal government, education officials, the judiciary, corrections, religion and the private sector, the three-year project of the commission is designed to accomplish these goals:

- To make recommendations to the states to improve educational opportunities of adult and juvenile offenders.
- To promote cooperation among state and local groups to bring about needed changes.
- To develop plans for implementing alternative educational approaches that take account of differing needs and resources of the states.

In addition to state involvement activities over a three-year period designed to provide the states opportunities to examine alternatives for improvement, ECS will provide educators, legislators, corrections professionals and governors in the states with comprehensive analyses of available research.

In recognition of the fact that there is little comprehensive research about correctional education—as there is little comprehensive research about correctional systems—the project will pull together the material that does exist. With an awareness that much of this research is not geared to meet policy-making needs, the policy implications of major research studies about corrections and correctional education will be distilled and provided to the states.

The following sections include analyses of two kinds of studies that relate directly to correctional education:

- The work of five national commissions that looked at a variety of critical issues in corrections, including correctional education.

- The five published national studies that specifically address, in a comprehensive way, issues in either adult or juvenile correctional education.

Although there are other minor studies, selection of these was decided on the basis of comprehensiveness, the need to exclude studies that duplicate other works and findings and availability to people who wish to review complete reports. Even with those criteria, it is evident that there are gaps in available materials, a lack of specificity and conflicting emphases about even the most fundamental issues in correctional education.

There is no adequate way to analyze these materials for common findings and recommendations. The purposes and methods of all the inquiries are different, the recommendations about education tend to be general and priorities for these cannot be ranked either within or between the studies. However, these works, because they are comprehensive in what they attempt to do, can and should be considered seriously by policy makers on their own merit. Each inquiry was conducted by highly qualified people to address specific needs relative to corrections and correctional education. Within their scope, all of the studies were meant to have an impact on national policy, and each made definitive and influential contributions toward definition of the problems in correctional education and feasible solutions.

“Correctional education” generally means the educational programs and processes available to adult and juvenile offenders after adjudication. Also, the term usually refers to institution-based education of inmates. The commission and research reports summarized here reflect this traditional interpretation for three reasons:

- Although most offenders are in communities on probation, parole or various “diversion” programs, the failures and problems of institutions—adult prisons, juvenile institutions and training schools—have gained more public notice over the past 10 years than the failures and problems of community programs.
- Despite the fact that the number of adjudicated offenders in communities is much greater than those in institutions (approximately 1,300,000 against 250,000), there are very few special educational programs for offenders in communities. This lack of national attention to development of community-based

corrections programs and educational opportunities for probationers and parolees has meant that there has been little for national commissions and research projects to evaluate. Institutional programs, therefore, have provided most of the substance for national inquiries.

- Although almost every national commission has said that development and utilization of community resources in corrections should be a primary focus of national corrections efforts, and that all educational programs—for offenders as well as staff—should be upgraded, 80 percent of corrections expenditures according to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) are still concentrated in custody and administrative areas, not programs. As a consequence, program development has not been consistent with commission

recommendations. Each commission has and will, therefore, continue to go over much the same ground.

In light of this, the ECS Correctional Education Project Advisory Committee is concerned about addressing the most difficult questions dealing with **implementation**, both of the recommendations of previous research projects and commissions and of its own recommendations. Through involvement of the states in 1976 and 1977, it is the intention of the committee to develop alternatives for state policy and administrative alignments, to develop model legislation and to indicate specifically how community agencies, schools and private agencies can assist in improving educational opportunities for both institutionalized offenders and those in communities. Recommendations centering on local jails incarcerating an estimated 700,000 adults and juveniles each day will also be made.

Even though each previous study or commission did not address each question, for the purpose of sorting and summarizing findings and recommendations about education into a common framework, the following questions were used:

- What kinds of educational services should be delivered to adult or juvenile offenders? (In what curricular areas should improvements be made and funds concentrated?)
- What kinds of improvements in the way services are delivered (environments, teachers and methods) to adult and juvenile offend-

ers are necessary to increase effectiveness of educational services?

- What should be the role of public schools (including colleges and universities) in correctional education?
- What should be the role of the private sector (volunteer groups, labor organizations, private enterprise, churches)?
- What means should be established to insure accountability of correctional education (evaluation, governance, etc.)?

Summary of *Corrections*

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals Washington, D.C. (1973)

A. Background

The report on *Corrections* issued by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, begun by the LEAA on Oct. 21, 1971, reported a clear statement of standards establishing a national strategy to reduce crime through improvement of police, judicial and correctional systems and practices.

Education of offenders was an important area of concentration in the work of the task force that examined corrections. In general, priority was given to more extensive use of community-based treatment alternatives—probation, parole, diversion and use of community correctional facilities—over institutional approaches. As a consequence, while recommendations were made for improvement of institution-based education, the intent of the commission was both to acknowledge the importance of improving education for offenders requiring incarceration and at the same time stress the need for more and better correctional services, including education, in the community.

Working closely with the staff, the 19 members of the task force on corrections developed 159 specific standards focusing on the problems of modern correctional practices and regulations. High recidivism rates, riot and unrest in prisons, allegations of brutality and degradation, the increasing litigation against correctional officials and indignant public reactions attested to the need for change in corrections.

The task force found that the American correctional system appeared to offer minimum protection for the public and maximum harm for offenders. Evidence reflected that the longer the period of incarceration, the smaller the chance those individuals would lead law-abiding lives on the outside. It found that education within the American correctional system has not kept pace with the social, economic, political and technological realities of society. The quality and relevance of educational programs, particularly in adult and juvenile institutions, have suffered tremendously because of this. The priorities established for community and institutional education are not commensurate with today's demands and expectation.

The task force developed standards and recommendations that will influence the correctional system and its relationship to the criminal justice system in this nation for years to come.

B. Findings and Recommendations

The task force proposed fundamental improvements in correctional education services and delivery networks:

- Educational curricula should be developed with inmate involvement and should teach social and coping skills as well as provide basic academic competency.
- Learning laboratories for basic skill development should be maintained by all education departments.
- Both educational and vocational programs should emphasize programmed instruction allowing maximum flexibility in scheduling, providing for self-pacing and giving immediate feedback on student progress.
- Along with meeting state certification requirements, teachers should have additional course work in social education, reading instruction and abnormal psychology.
- Teachers in juvenile institutions should also be certified to teach exceptional children and have experience in teaching inner-city children.
- Each education department should have a certified school psychologist and a student personnel worker.
- Selected offenders should participate in instructional roles in both educational and vocational programs.
- Each education department should make optimal use of educational programs at local colleges, work-study programs, work-release programs and work-furlough programs.
- Correspondence courses should be made available to inmates for course work that cannot be obtained locally.

- There is a critical lack of special educational programs for offenders placed in communities. Community resources—existing public and private schools, colleges and universities—should be fully utilized for both educational and vocational programs.
- Each education department should develop a system of reporting and evaluation that utilizes community representatives.
- Institutions should critically examine their educational and vocational training programs

to insure that these programs meet standards that emphasize on-going and comprehensive individualized education and training. These should include:

- a. An annual evaluation of achievement data to reassure the effectiveness of all programs.
- b. A systematic appraisal of all educational programs using community representatives as well as inmates and education staff members.

Summary of Educational Programs in Adult Correctional Institutions

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
Boulder, Colorado (1973)

A. Background

This study of correctional education for adult offenders was completed by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) during the summer of 1973. The primary objective of the study was to obtain an accurate picture of the current status of academic educational programs in adult correctional facilities. A survey form was sent to 249 state and federal correctional facilities; 150 responded.

The problem researched was the current status of academic educational programs, particularly at the elementary and secondary levels, available to inmates of adult correctional facilities.

Some of the recommendations of the study included increasing the competencies of educators to deal with a myriad of special learning problems, adding educational and vocational counselors to the staffs of correctional institutions and increasing expenditures for diagnostic testing.

Many people in education familiar with some aspects of corrections became aware of the shocking lack of knowledge about the state of education in correctional settings. There was a desire on the part of the U.S. Office of Education to find out what particular resources actually existed and to determine needs in the area of new educational programs.

The outcome of the survey was a baseline report of existing programs. This was expected to contribute to sound planning for future changes.

Administrators of the correctional institutions were sent the survey instrument in June 1973. The survey included 25 items. No statistical tests were employed in the analysis of data. By late September 1973, 60 percent of those institutions had responded by returning a completed questionnaire. Due to the good response and the fairly uniform geographic distribution of returns it can be concluded that the information obtained was reasonably representative of educational programs in adult correctional institutions in the United States.

B. Findings and Recommendations

- Teachers in correctional facilities have found that inmates have learning handicaps and emotional problems and lack of motivation.
- Only 20 percent of the teachers had special education training.
- Seventy-four percent of the correctional institutions surveyed indicated a need for more and better diagnostic testing of inmates.
- Additional personnel are needed, particularly as academic and vocational counselors, general counselors and librarians.
- There is a need for more specialized teachers of students with particular learning problems.
- The average student-teacher ratio for all correctional institutions was 11.38 students for each teacher.
- Twenty-four percent of the institutions use team teaching, 40 percent use open classrooms, 67 percent use diagnostic testing, 42 percent have special educational programs and 57 percent use individualized teaching techniques.
- Eleven percent of the inmates are participating in remedial or elementary-level programs, another 11 percent are in GED or high school-level programs, 6 percent are in college programs and 17 percent are involved in vocational programs.

The vast majority of the people surveyed (69 percent) indicated that individualized teaching techniques would definitely improve educational programs and quality. Another significant proportion of people (62 percent) indicated that coordination of programs inside correctional institutions would improve the quality of educational programs.

Thirty-four percent of the institutions surveyed claimed that additional academic teachers were badly needed. Thirty-six percent stated that vocational and educational counselors also were badly needed.

Of the institutions surveyed, 48 percent needed more money, 45 percent needed more space and facilities, 36 percent needed special educational materials, 35 percent needed continuing educa-

tion for teachers and 26 percent claimed that linkages with the community would help to improve the educational programs.

Summary of *GED Testing in State Penal Institutions*

John J. Marsh, *Correctional Education*, Vol. 25, No. 1, Winter 1973

A. Background

In 1972 John J. Marsh began an inquiry into the implementation of GED tests, particularly to the role of these tests in the total rehabilitation plan of penitentiaries. In April 1972 a survey instrument was sent to every state administrator of the General Education Diploma (GED) testing program. Tentative conclusions and recommendations were made regarding attitudes of state departments of education and potential areas of research relating GED test scores with recidivism, frequency of early parole, job retention, etc.

Correspondence between John Marsh and the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences of the American Council on Education revealed a lack of information at the national level regarding details of the procedures and policies of the administration of the GED in correctional facilities. According to the author, the survey was a "scouting maneuver" to locate the soft spots and determine the likely targets for further research and study.

A 16-item questionnaire was sent to the state administrator of the GED testing program in all 50 states. The survey instrument was prefaced with three restrictions: (a) only state-operated programs were included as a part of the sample; (b) correctional institutions were the only institutions included in the sample; (c) the instrument was to be completed only by state department of education personnel, not correctional staff. In August 1972, four months after the initial surveys were sent out, 49 of the 50 states had returned a completed questionnaire.

B. Findings and Recommendations

General findings and recommendations are the following:

- Some state departments of education do not see the GED preparation and testing program

as more than an "administrative" responsibility.

- There is an apparent lack of research in the area of the GED in penal institutions, especially as these standardized data correlate to recidivism, frequency of early parole, job retention, etc.
- There were many unanswered questions generated by the returned questionnaire, including: (a) What is the failure or success on re-test rate? (b) What are the different methods of preparation of the inmate for the GED and what are their comparative success rates? (c) How are these programs financed?

The study indirectly concluded that state departments of education could benefit from a more detailed knowledge of correctional institutions. Further, educators and legislators could contribute to better delivery of educational services in correctional institutions if they took an active interest in the topic. The author did not elaborate on what form this active interest might take.

The author did not speculate on what role, if any, colleges or public schools could play in the improvement of GED content, testing or evaluation of GED preparation programs. The focus was on state departments of education, the American Council on Education and correctional institutions. The author did not deal with the role of the private sector in the administration of the GED.

Recommendations for planning and monitoring of educational services were the following:

- The standardized test scores of the GED should be used to do basic research in many areas of corrections. The author listed a few suggestions for possible correlative research.
- The author made some broad hints about the need for more research in the area of correctional education.

Summary of *An Evaluation of "NewGate" and Other Prisoner Education Programs*

Marshall, Kaplan, Gans and Kahn, April 1973

A. Background

This study provides a comprehensive review and evaluation of college-level prison educational programs in nine states, including five NewGate programs—Oregon, Minnesota, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Kentucky—and four other prison college educational programs. Project NewGate was begun as a federally funded project in 1969 to provide postsecondary education to institutionalized adults. By 1972, eight states had NewGate programs with full-time staff providing counseling, some placement in community educational programs, college-level instruction and postrelease supportive services. The four non-NewGate programs—Illinois State Penitentiary; Menard Texas Department of Correction; the Eastham Unit of Huntsville, Texas; the Federal Correctional Institution, Lompoc, Calif.; and a college parole plan at the California State University at San Diego—were selected on the basis of their constituting significant variations from the NewGate programs. The study was funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and conducted by the consulting firm of Marshall, Kaplan, Gans and Kahn, San Francisco, Calif. The final report was completed in April 1973. The study was directed by John Irwin, who has since become a professor of sociology at San Francisco State College.

One of two basic research objectives of the study was to determine if these college-level educational programs affected the postprison careers of the program participants. The primary research method selected to perform this objective was a follow-up of 40 participants from each of the nine study sites. An initial sample of 50 was selected at each program, with the intention of actually completing 40 follow-up interviews. They were chosen randomly from a subset of the total list of released participants. Participants were defined as persons who had (a) passed from the inside phase of a program to the outside phase; (b) earned 12 semester units or their equivalent (15 quarter units) in the inside program even though they dropped out or were expelled; (c) were presently involved in a NewGate program; or (d) in the case of the College as a Parole Plan at San Diego State College, all participants who were admitted. The subset consisted of those participating in NewGate programs who were released before

Jan. 1, 1972, and those participating in non-NewGate programs who have taken courses during or after the fall of 1969 and were released before Jan. 1, 1972.

Two different instruments were used on the follow-up sample. The first was a baseline data schedule on which information from the prison files was gathered. The second was a follow-up interview schedule completed in a face-to-face field interview by one of the study's staff.

Attempts were made to create control groups, but these were contaminated early in the research, and the focus was shifted to the utilization of comparison groups. This distinguished the validity of any generalizations that might be drawn from the research findings. The control/comparison groups were interviewed using basically the same instruments as were used in interviewing the program participants.

The second general research objective was to evaluate and compare the different college educational programs themselves. The principal data collection techniques used included structured interviews of education staff, instructors, prison administrators and guards. In addition, as many inside participants as possible were given three separate self-administered instruments, all constructed especially for this study: the self-administered program participant questionnaire, the self-administered esteem/confidence scale and the attitude change scale. The first of these—the program participant questionnaire—supplied information about different aspects of the program and the participants' attitudes regarding the programs. The second—the esteem/confidence scale—gave some comparison between programs as to the amount of self-esteem and self-confidence of the participants. The last instrument—the attitude change scale—was aimed at measuring the change in the attitudes of the participant toward himself and other meaningful persons and in his perception of changes in others' attitudes toward him.

B. Findings and Recommendations

The Marshall, Kaplan, Gans and Kahn study provides a large number of detailed findings and recommendations regarding the development of institutional adult offender college educational programs. These findings may be summarized as follows:

To the extent that the various measures of program success differentiated among program participants and similar inmates not enrolled in a college educational program, the results indicate that participation in a NewGate program results in a more successful postrelease career. When compared to a matched group of nonparticipant inmates, NewGate participants were more likely to be employed or in school, to have better job stability, less likely to have continued drug or drinking problems and more likely to continue their education.

Although these findings, as well as those of the case study (see chapter 3 of the study), suggest that NewGate is a successful program, this success was not reflected in lower recidivism rates.

In addition to two analyses of postprison careers, an attempt was also made to estimate the economic benefit to the society in terms of tax dollars generated by persons following their participation in one of the college prison programs. Based on a 20-year projection from income tax levels found among the program participants following release, the study concluded "that prison college educational programs pay for themselves." With one exception (the Ashland program), the increase in tax dollars generated by increased education work levels was reported to have more than repaid the costs to the taxpayers of providing that education, based on the 20-year projection.

The board recommendations of the study are summarized below in a form that provides an overview of an extensive discussion of more specific issues and recommendations that are contained within Chapter VI of this study.

- "College programs in prison that provide a college atmosphere beyond the classroom and offer complementary support services (e.g., special recruitment, academic, vocational and therapeutic counseling, remedial instruction, prerelease assistance and financial and emotional support on a college campus after release) appear to be the most effective kinds of programs in fulfilling educational goals.
- "The college program in prison should be addressed and equipped to meet the needs of inmates who not only demonstrated capability and motivation but also those with latent potential.
- "There should be an open-admissions policy that permits all inmates to participate who can meet and maintain certain objective performance standards. This admissions policy should be accompanied by a vigorous outreach

effort to acquaint all inmates with the program and a college preparatory component that helps applicants make up academic deficiencies. This admissions policy should also be accompanied by giving full-time status to all admitted students who want it and by providing a large number and diversity of course offerings, tutorials and special independent study assignments to students who still have several years before possible release.

- "Persons composing the staff of prison college programs should be mainly drawn from and maintain roots in the academic community. There also should be periodic staff rotation from the prison to the college. No staff member should work more than three years in any prison college program.
- "Therapy should be offered to inmates as part of their academic program. Both individual and group sessions should be offered and inmates should be permitted to participate on a voluntary basis. Finally, information revealed in therapy sessions should not be used for the purpose of inmate evaluation, surveillance, fact finding or interrogation. No staff member should be involved in evaluating students to whom he is giving therapy.
- "Decisions to provide financial support in the postrelease phase of a college program should be made on the basis of objective predetermined standards of performance.
- "In setting up a postrelease component, the college program should try to concentrate its released participants on one or two nearby campuses and support them by an after-care office. Ideally, the outside program should be situated on a large urban or large rural campus while also providing the option to its students of attending a smaller college nearby.
- "While attending school on campus, program participants should have part-time jobs after a minimum period of adjustment. These jobs should be related to their studies (e.g., teaching, tutoring, counseling, research).
- "Released students on outside support should be required to live in a program residence house for a minimum period. However, the length of time required to stay in one transitional stage (e.g., program residence house, study release status, parole, etc.) should be short and made explicit."

The Marshall, Kaplan and Gans study further recommended that prison-based college programs should define their relationship with external environments in the following specific ways:

- "Program operations should neither be completely fused with nor completely insulated from the prison routine. While certain areas of autonomy must be guaranteed and preserved by the college program, certain areas in which there is a potential source of disagreement should be narrowed through negotiation. In addition, the college program should compensate the prison administration for its losses in authority by providing the prison new unexpected benefits (e.g., enhancing the high school and vocational educational programs).
- "The college program should prevent the development of resentment and division between its participants and inmates in the general population. It should do the following things: (1) grant participants only those extra privileges that are functionally required by the student role; (2) assign its students a regular formal role providing education and perhaps other services to nonparticipants; (3) adhere to a deliberate and highly visible policy of recruiting persons from all class and ethnic backgrounds; (4) if necessary, contrive a balance by making special provisions to assist persons who do not meet all qualifications at

the outset (without lowering standards); and (5) influence the prison to develop comparable opportunities for other inmates who are not interested in the college program.

- "College programs should not intervene in release decisions. Release on study or parole should be automatic and based on predetermined criteria. If such decisions are not made this way, the college program should exert its influence to change procedure rather than to sacrifice the quality of its program by approaching the problem on a piecemeal basis.
- "The university system should be integrally involved in the prison college program, sharing with the prison in the planning, administering and governing functions. One possible mechanism for performing these functions is a governing board of directors consisting of representatives from the prison and the university.
- "The college program should be structured inside the prison as part of a parallel authority hierarchy that has links with the university system that provides it resources and expertise."

Summary of *School Behind Bars—A Descriptive Overview of Correctional Education in the American Prison System*

Syracuse University Research Corporation (1973)

A. Background

The Syracuse University Study (SURC), completed in June 1973, with Michael Reagen, project director, provides a general overview of problems and needs, primarily in adult correctional education. Between January and June 1973, prisons, prison officials, teachers and others across the country were interviewed and site evaluations were conducted. General recommendations for improvement of adult correctional education were made to the Ford Foundation, sponsor of the study.

The poor quality of educational services available to adult offenders, primarily in prisons, was researched. According to SURC, a number of smaller, less comprehensive studies have indicated critical educational needs of both adult and juvenile offenders. More comprehensive studies were needed to determine the national extent of these educational needs and the nature of educational services being made available. Because of the "volatility" of prisons and the apparent inability of decision makers to deal with significant problems, including educational needs, SURC conducted the study to provide for the Ford Foundation what its researchers called the first "descriptive overview of correctional education in the U.S." (p. vi). Public attitudes, professional inattention to educational needs, jealousy of correctional officers, cultural and racial differences in prisons, "prisonization" factors, physical structures of prisons and lack of critical research are identified as significant barriers to improvement.

According to project staff, the report is not to be considered the definitive work on educational programs in American prisons, but to:

- Provide a descriptive-analytical overview of programs.
- Provide answers to basic questions.
- Support alternative ways of making improvements.
- Discuss critical elements of prisons that affect correctional education.

Correctional officials and others involved in prison education were interviewed at 38 prisons and 17 central prison system offices in 27 states across the country. The resource network was made up of 360 documents and discussions with 300 individuals. Questionnaires were used for formal interviews. These, with the analysis summary forms, are included at the back of the study.

Although a cross section of programs was evaluated—ranging from jails to 20 institutions "distinguished by the uniqueness and excellence of their programs"—and prisoners, ex-offenders and correctional professionals were interviewed, there is no claim in the study that it is "representative" in a research sense or comprehensive. The study was, however, conducted in a way consistent with the study objectives indicated above.

B. Findings and Recommendations

General recommendations are advanced regarding curriculum, objectives and the philosophy of offender education.

- Curricula should be diverse enough to meet differing needs and expectations of inmates. Both curricula and teachers should avoid content and teaching methods that have the effect of reinforcing feelings of inadequacy or inferiority.
- Vocational programs should be relevant to the job market and help to insure satisfying employment.
- Curricula should be generally adopted to systems change in corrections, particularly to make use of community resources as corrections moves toward community-based corrections.
- Educational objectives should be redefined. "It is not immediately clear what the revisions may entail" (p. 273). For example, since trained offenders typically don't find jobs in the area of their training, "the contents and methods" of vocational education need to be "revised accordingly."

- Affective as well as cognitive goals should be stressed to improve attitudes and self-confidence.
- There should be adequate diagnosis of educational or training needs. Achievement levels, native abilities and future objectives should be thoroughly considered.
- Training standards for teaching staff and quality of methods and training should be raised. "Cost-effective education will be secured most readily by raising rather than by lowering standards from the state we are presently in" (p. 275). There should be increased "professionalization" to attract competent teachers.
- Technological advances should be used because they may increase motivation, are standardized and validated (e.g., programmed instruction) and may remove interpersonal problems of teachers and inmates.
- Educational management and administration should be upgraded and "professionalization" encouraged.
- Business and industry should be encouraged to participate in job training and placement.
- Efforts to reintegrate offenders should be bolstered. "Bridging, supporting and reinforcing" activities should be strengthened and spread out over longer periods of time.
- Teachers should instruct in positive ways. They should not come across as "missionaries."
- Involvement of colleges and universities in delivery of education to offenders is promising; however, it should be done after a "concerted effort of planning and research." These possibilities should be explored to expand inmate involvement in education.
- All educational programs should "articulate more closely with institutions and organizations of the free community" (p. 283).
- Involvement should address principal problems of the past.
 - a. Outside programs have agendas other than prison education and regard prison education as tangential to their principal concerns.
 - b. Typical programs have had volunteer teachers who, because they were volunteers, lent little stability or continuity to educational programs.
 - c. Such programs, as a success criterion, "could be managed by those managing the prison community" (p. 263).
- Business and industry should be more extensively involved. Volunteers should be used with care in educational delivery.
- Recommendations above should be utilized as criteria for success.
- Basic research into education as an aspect of corrections should be expanded.
- Strong evaluation components in educational programs are essential.
- Evaluative research about differential outcomes should be done.
- Educational programs should be able to adapt to rapidly changing demands in a complex society. "Heavy commitments to traditional procedures and structures should be avoided" (p. 282).
- The Ford Foundation should establish a national corrections foundation to set standards, in large part, for correctional education and provide support for needed improvements.

Summary of *Education for the Youthful Offender in Correctional Institutions*

Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education
Boulder, Colorado (1972)

A. Background

The WICHE study of educational services for juvenile offenders was completed in late 1972. A survey was sent to 40 juvenile correctional institutions in the western U. S., including about 500 teachers and over 7,500 youths. The purpose of the study was to assess the kinds and quality of educational services in juvenile correctional facilities. Specific recommendations for improvement of juvenile correctional education were made.

According to the findings, one million children come to the attention of the courts annually; 50,000 delinquent children are confined in correctional institutions and most of these youth are educationally behind their age group. The typical delinquent youth has an academic competence one to four years below the average for his age.

The study was not intended to be representative of all juvenile correctional programs. The study was designed to: (a) define the problem in such a way that solutions could be devised and (b) develop position statements that would provide the basis for solutions.

Superintendents of 40 western juvenile correctional institutions were contacted. Permission was granted to send the survey instrument to the education director of each institution. Four of the 40 institutions had no educational program; of the remaining 36, 29 (80 percent) responded to the questionnaire.

B. Findings and Recommendations

Conclusions of the survey took many forms and touched many areas in corrections philosophy and practice. The following are a number of the findings and recommendations.

- The overall student-teacher ratio was 8.93 students for each teacher.
- Sixty-seven percent of the vocational teachers are paid by the correctional institution in which they work.
- Eighty percent of the institutional schools use individually prescribed instruction, and about half of the inmate students participate in this.
- Specific social skills needed in dealing with real-life problems outside the institution are taught in very few schools.
- Most education directors felt they had adequate classrooms, but over one-third said they had insufficient books, library facilities and special materials.
- Median salary for all teachers in the survey was \$11,363.
- Although only about 10 percent of the students are below high school age, 60 percent of them have not achieved beyond the eighth grade.
- Teachers report that about half the students are seen as having reading difficulties or other problems requiring remedial training; 71 percent are reported as having social problems that interfere with their ability to make academic progress; 43 percent have emotional problems; and the list of learning problems goes on.
- Nearly half (47 percent) the teachers of academic subjects judged their formal education as inadequate.
- The physical remoteness of correctional institutions has worked to sever ties with the community.
- Community attitudes against delinquent youth present serious social barriers.
- Educational resources in institutions are often inadequate, of poor quality and irrelevant to future educational or vocational pursuits.
- Public schools will have to find a way of delivering self-enhancing education with an emphasis on humanizing interpersonal relationships.
- Career education could be easily realized in a number of ways, including work-study pro-

grams, internships, apprenticeships, vocational and professional study and individual assignments to paid and volunteer crafts people.

- Extensive efforts should be made to encourage the utilization of ex-offenders in the instructional process.
- Inservice and specialized training for existing educational staff could be taught through higher education facilities, providing credit to teachers.

- Institutions of higher education should develop meaningful curricula for students going to corrections education.

- Public schools should move to involve students in school governance and other areas of school life once reserved only for faculty and administrators.

- Career education, if the public schools would adopt it comprehensively, would unite the school to the world of work.

Summary of *The Criminal Offender—What Should Be Done*

President's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation

January 1970

A. Background

This task force met from Oct. 16, 1969, to Jan. 27, 1970, to determine federal priorities for prisoner rehabilitation. Three criteria were used to develop the final report: (1) urgent need, (2) probable public acceptance and (3) probable financial support. Previous recommendations were studied by 14 interdisciplinary people. The task force made broad recommendations about correctional system changes and the role of the federal government. Recommendations about education were limited and general.

The task of this commission was to make general recommendations about offender rehabilitation, both adult and juvenile. Apparently, no original research was conducted. The commission assigned priorities to research findings and recommendations already complete to assist the federal government and states toward implementation of improvements.

The commission "concluded early that there was no need . . . to search for new ideas about rehabilitating prisoners . . . the voluminous literature on the subject overflowed with excellent ideas that never have been implemented nor, in many cases, even tested. . . . We conceived our task as one of devising mechanisms through which the federal government might help convert a few of the most promising of those ideas into action."

The commission sought to recommend actions that would be both publicly and financially supportable at the time the commission issued its report.

Since recommendations about education were part of general recommendations about corrections and the overall inquiry method did not involve research, there were no specific target groups. Priorities were assigned according to financial and public support constraints to possible changes in corrections. Educational changes were part of those recommendations. No claim was made by the commission for comprehensiveness. Members formed committees in

priority areas, heard presentations and consulted with various groups.

B. Findings and Recommendations

The commission's recommendations were exclusively limited to vocational training. Jobs for offenders and needed training were seen to be most critical and at the heart of any correctional program. The following recommendations were made:

- "The President should establish a national agency to stimulate, in the states and localities, adoption of programs for the employment and training of criminal offenders" (p. 2).
- "The United States Civil Service Commission should devise and put into operation a plan to stimulate federal employment of ex-offenders" (p. 2).
- "The Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., should undertake a study of the ways its annual dividend to the treasury might be used in the area of prisoner rehabilitation, with special emphasis on jobs and job-training programs" (p. 4).
- "The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice of the Department of Justice should frame guidelines for state and local governments concerning the employment of ex-offenders" (p. 2).
- Regionalization. Two additional recommendations were made bearing on education: to provide better services, including education to people, on short-term sentences, the federal government should encourage the states to regionalize jail systems and pool financial and service resources. Secondly, the federal government should encourage regionalization of diagnostic facilities for offenders, including those on parole and probation, in order to better determine which services should be provided. It was recommended that selected metropolitan areas should be used.

Summary of *A Time to Act*

The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower Washington, D.C. (1968)

A. Background

The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, established by the Correctional Rehabilitation Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-178), conducted a three-year study of educational and training resources of the correctional employees of the country. In determining the manpower, education and training resources required to increase the effectiveness of the employees of the correctional field responsible for adult and juvenile offenders, the commission found that apathy, inadequate funding, piecemeal programming and lack of public support and understanding characterize the correctional field.

The purposes of the study were to determine the adequacy of educational and training resources for persons in and about to enter the correction field, the effectiveness of methods of recruiting personnel and the extent to which personnel in the field are utilized in making optimum use of their various qualifications.

Additionally, the study was intended to enlighten the educational community; federal, state and local legislative bodies; and the general public to allow all to work together with the correctional community to bring about a more effective correctional system.

Every adult and juvenile federal and state correctional institution and every state-level probation and parole agency in the country was surveyed or consulted to gather the necessary information on the 111,000-plus employees of the correctional system (excluding those working at jails). In examining ways to enhance the capabilities of those employees responsible for over 1,115,000 adult and juvenile offenders in a system spending in excess of \$1 billion, the 95 member organizations of the Joint Commission aided the study. Three major national surveys, study seminars, consultant papers, special research projects and site visitations were all used in the effort to reach the study's objectives.

B. Findings and Recommendations

The commission found generally that the quality of services that inmates can expect to receive

are limited by the extent of the quality of preparation that the employees of the corrections field bring with them. Sixty-five percent of the top administrators within the juvenile correctional field and 60 percent in the adult area reported serious problems recruiting "treatment-trained" personnel (counselors, teachers, social workers, etc.).

Specific recommendations:

- Colleges, universities and private groups with experience and capabilities in the training field should develop "training-of-trainers" programs to meet the needs for adequately trained personnel.
- Colleges, universities and private groups should also join in an active manner to seek federal funds to coordinate the federal effort in educating and training of correctional employees. This appears to be a poorly coordinated federal effort.
- The undergraduate degree should be a required qualifier for entry-level positions in probation and parole.
- Serious efforts should be extended by colleges, universities and the federal government to develop and assist on-going educational efforts aimed at producing degree-carrying individuals within the criminal justice area.
- A national recruitment program should be aimed at uplifting the general public's image of the correctional field. This would also allow persons interested in becoming employed within the field to do so.
- State and local agencies providing such basic services as education and vocational education should expand their programs to insure a greatly increased level of available services to offenders in the community.
- In areas such as management development, research, basic education and job training, the private sector may be better able to provide considerable experience, and federal and state funding should be made available to investigate this.

Summary of *State-Local Relations in the Criminal Justice System*

Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, August 1971

A. Background

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations report was issued and approved in January 1971 and printed in August. A 26-member advisory panel of private and public sector representatives—state, local and federal—made recommendations based on staff work to examine alternatives for improvement in intergovernmental cooperation in criminal justice processes. Court, police courts and corrections were studied, and both adult and juvenile areas were covered. Recommendations about education were limited and general, focusing primarily on adults in prison.

The commission examined the operations and problems of 50 state-local criminal justice systems. Special attention was given to the need for more expeditious and coordinated processes.

"To examine, evaluate and recommend changes designed to strengthen the intergovernmental relations that undergird" the criminal justice system, the commission identified the following major problem areas specific to corrections:

- "State-local reorganization of corrections administration.
- "Interlocal cooperation in the development of regional penal facilities.
- "Expanded paraprofessional involvement in correctional systems.
- "Mechanisms for promoting greater interfunctional cooperation" (p. 11).

Identification of standards for organization, funding and evaluation of police, court and corrections functions was identified as critical. By focusing specifically on the intergovernmental processes of the criminal justice system, the commission hoped to supplement the work of previous commissions to address state and local implementation issues.

Priority areas for inquiry and recommendation were decided on the basis of time constraints and the overall mandate to make specific contributions to intergovernmental processes. As with its other studies of various state-local and federal-state concern, the commission staff prepared historical and factual data from available sources, provided an analysis of issues and indicated alternative solutions.

B. Findings and Recommendations

- In recognition that traditional custodial facilities have generally failed to reintegrate offenders, community-based programs should be expanded.
- Preservice and inservice training of all staff, including teachers, should be markedly improved.
- Because "over four-fifths of the offenders from 25 to 64 years of age confined in correctional institutions lacked a high school diploma," better services should be provided. Academic curricula, teacher competence and teaching materials should be improved.
- Vocational training and prison industries should be upgraded.
- Compensation rates should be raised to attract more qualified teachers.
- Professional counselors should be employed to help inmates set up programs to help prepare them for community life.
- Incentives should be developed to encourage more inmates to participate in vocational training and prison industry programs.
- Modern work methods and management practices, repeal of laws forbidding sale of prison-made goods and control of restrictive labor union practices should be initiated to improve the success of prison industries.
- Use of programmed instruction can be expanded.
- Through regionalization of facilities, including jails and detention centers, work and study release programs should be expanded, allowing pre- and post-conviction prisoners to spend more time in their communities.
- Universities and colleges should be encouraged to offer extension courses within correctional institutions. They can also assist with noncredit self-improvement courses.
- Private industry should be encouraged to operate branch plants in or near correctional institutions to provide training of inmates at prevailing wages.

Aside from systems improvement recommendations aimed at the entire correctional system, both juvenile and adult, the commission did not make specific recommendations about how quality educational services could be insured through shifting and tightening of state or local authority. The recommendation most germane

to the issue of educational accountability was that "... the states' responsibility for correctional activities, excluding the adjudicatory functions of granting paroles or pardons, be vested in one state department or agency directly accountable to the governor" (p. 56).

Summary of *The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice: Task Force on Corrections*

Washington, D.C. (1967)

A. Background

Mandated by former President Lyndon Johnson, the Task Force on Corrections of the Commission of Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice issued its report in February 1967. A definitive study of all states and many foreign countries was conducted to obtain comprehensive data on all phases of corrections. Correctional education was not given thorough treatment. Recommendations in this area were advanced as part of the comprehensive report on corrections, covering both juvenile and adult areas. Education with regard to institutions,

parole, probation and other community programs were discussed.

Standards for educational services were developed as part of the more extensive attempt to "identify the minimal conditions required to carry out correctional programs satisfactorily and to permit experimentation for continued change and improvement" (p. ix). With regard to education, the following graphs summarize levels of education of institutionalized inmates. Comparable data for levels of services were not developed.

FIGURE 1: COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL LEVELS

		General Population and Institutional Inmates			
	Years of School Completed*	%	General Population	Inmate Population	%
College	4 years or more	8.4	=====	=====	1.1
	1 to 3 years	9.4	=====	=====	4.2
High School	4 years	27.5	=====	=====	12.4
	1 to 3 years	20.7	=====	=====	27.6
Elementary	5 to 8 years	28.0	=====	=====	40.3
	4 years to none	6.0	=====	=====	14.4

*By persons aged 25-64

Source: U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration, Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research, based on data from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

FIGURE 2: COMPARISON OF OCCUPATION EXPERIENCE

		General Labor Force and Institutional Inmates			
		%	General Labor Force	Inmate Prior Work Experience	%
Professional and technical workers		10.4	=====	=====	2.2
Managers and owners, including farm		16.3	=====	=====	4.3
Clerical and sales		14.2	=====	=====	7.1
Craftsmen, foremen		20.6	=====	=====	17.6
Operatives		21.2	=====	=====	25.2
Service workers, including household		6.4	=====	=====	11.5
Laborers (except mine) incl. farm laborers and foremen		10.8	=====	=====	31.9

* All data are for males only since the correctional institution population is 95 percent male, data for males were used to eliminate the effects of substantial differences between male and female occupational employment patterns.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration, Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research, based on data from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

"Assertions about the correctional enterprise in the United States have been characterized more by rhetoric and polemic than factual documentation." Gathering of comprehensive and reliable information was seen as the major task of this commission.

In addition to the collection of reliable data to aid in program planning, the commission sought to identify the most promising theories and practices in corrections.

A major Law Enforcement Assistance Administration-funded survey of every state and 250 countries was conducted. The survey sought statistical information on costs, nature and magnitude of correctional programs. The National Center on Crime and Delinquency was the principal contractor for the survey research and for interviews conducted with people and groups in every state.

Statistical results of the national and international studies are included to be read with the full task force report. Standards for evaluating data were developed from previous work of the American Correctional Association, the Children's Bureau of the Department of HEW, National Council on Crime and Delinquency and the National Association of Training Schools.

B. Findings and Recommendations

- National attempts should be expanded to promote adequate diagnosis and differential treatment of offenders. This would result in more cost-effective use of public funds.
- There should be regionalization or sharing of educational and other services, particularly for small and short-term facilities.
- Efforts should be made to minimize disruption of schooling for juvenile offenders. Jail educational services for adults and services in juvenile detention centers should be greatly expanded.
- Vocational training and job-placement services should be improved and expanded.
- Public attitudes, state and local regulations barring hiring of offenders should be systematically addressed.
- No limit should be placed on educational opportunities, even though the greatest need is for adult basic or General Education Diploma (GED) level instruction.
- Interstate trade barriers should be revised to allow interstate marketing of prison-produced goods. Prison industries should be "profes-

sionalized" through staff, salaries, sales and marketing practice improvements.

- Work and study release opportunities should be expanded for both juveniles and adults.
- Inmate instructors should be used only if they are qualified and can effectively work as teachers while subject to inmate social pressures. Commitment and credibility of teachers are principal factors.
- Programmed instruction should be used more often, in addition to regular teaching and counseling services, in both adult and juvenile institutions.
- Public schools have been and should be used to provide particular remedial instruction to offenders through contracts of probation departments and public schools; to work closely with probation and parole officers to help offenders make their way through school problems; and to provide tutoring and counseling using specially trained workers to assist juveniles who may be on the verge of dropping out or who have been expelled.
- Colleges and universities should play larger parts in projects to help offenders with motivational, behavioral and education problems. These can best be conducted outside institutions.
- Public schools, colleges and universities should cooperate with corrections to expand work and study release programs. A number of models exist for these arrangements.
- University staff and academic experience should be applied to critical areas of staff training and research.

Because of their unique history in promoting correctional improvements and because they are normally outside governmental control, national and local private groups should be given support to accomplish work in corrections, using the following criteria:

- "Projects that, by their nature, would be inappropriate for governmental implementation. An obvious example would be a survey of public agencies in a situation in which the independence of the survey is a prime consideration.
- "Projects in community situations where research is needed but no competent public research resources are in sight.
- "Projects where the findings could be communicated and put to use through the network of a private organization" (p. 112).

Recommendations for planning and monitoring of educational services follow:

- Research and action programs should be more closely tied.
- There should be greater comparability of standards and definitions.
- Evaluation should be integral to the management process.

- Concentrated efforts should be made to define which data are relevant to which kinds of decisions.

A high priority was given to coordination and integration of all correctional functions. Many of the organizational recommendations that are made have direct bearing on delivery of educational services but are not included in detail here.

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION PROJECT

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman

The Honorable Ed Herschler
Governor of Wyoming

Vice Chairman

Mrs. Carolyn Warner
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Arizona State Department of Education

Members

Grant Anderson
Vice President, National Association
of State Boards of Education

John Armore
Director, Ex-Offender Program
National Alliance of Businessmen

Willard Barrett
Counselor
Minnesota Restitution House

Janet Carsetti
Director, Project READ
American Correctional Association

The Honorable Parker Evatt
South Carolina State Representative

Tom Gibbons
Coordinator, Pupil Personnel Services
New York School District #12

The Honorable Joseph Harder
Kansas State Senator

Ruby Herd
President, El Centro College
Dallas, Texas

Richard Hongisto
Sheriff, San Francisco

Chuck Ivery
Manager, Criminal Justice Program
United States Jaycees

Mortimer LeCote
Secretary, Criminal Justice
American Friends Service Committee

Thomas Martinez
Counselor/Caseworker
Denver Department of Health and Hospitals

Stanley McFarland
Director of Government Relations
National Education Association

Barbara O'Brien
Assistant Director
New York City Probation Department

Alan Parker
American Indian Policy Review Commission

Leo Perlis
Director, Community Services
AFL-CIO

The Honorable Justine Polier
Director, Juvenile Justice Division
Right to Care and Treatment
Children's Defense Fund

Milton Rector
President, National Council
on Crime and Delinquency

R. Wayne Richey
Executive Secretary
Iowa Board of Regents

Felix Rodriquez
Administrative Assistant
New Mexico Department
of Corrections

The Honorable Gordon Sandison
Washington State Senator

Rosemary Sarri
Co-Director, National Assessment
of Juvenile Corrections Project

The Reverend Albert Schneider
Principal, St. Francis Xavier School
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Kenneth Schoen
Commissioner
Minnesota Department of Corrections

Amber Scholtz
Legislative Assistant
U. S. Representative Paul N. McCloskey

The Honorable Morgan Smith
Colorado State Representative

The Honorable Dorothy Taylor
Louisiana State Representative

Anthony Travisono
Executive Director
American Correctional Association

The Honorable Zita Weinshienk
Judge, Denver District Court

William Welsh
Director of Legislative Action
American Federation of State,
County and Municipal Employees



The Education Commission of the States is a nonprofit organization formed by interstate compact in 1966. Forty-five states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are now members. Its goal is to further a working relationship among governors, state legislators and educators for the improvement of education. This report is an outcome of one of many Commission undertakings at all levels of education. The Commission offices are located at 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203.